



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,277	07/11/2003	Baskaran Dharmarajan	MS1-1565US	4822
22971 7590 06/04/2007 MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			EXAMINER LE, MIRANDA	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com
a-rydore@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/618,277

Applicant(s)

DHARMARAJAN ET AL.

Examiner

Miranda Le

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/16/07 has been entered.

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 04/16/07.

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 13, 18, 21 are independent claims. This action is made non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-12, 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ebbo et al. (US Pub No. 20030025728).

Art Unit: 2167

Ebbo anticipated independent claims 1, 7, 18, 21 by the following:

As to claims 1, 18, Ebbo, in Figs. 2, 3, discloses all the claimed subject matter of a method comprising:

receiving a request for a Web Page (“HTTP requests 214” - Fig. 2, [0031]; “In operation 300, client transmits an HTTP request with a URL specifying an ASP+ resource, in operation 302, *the server receives the HTTP request*” - Fig. 3, [0036]);

identifying an Active Server Page associated with the requested Web page, (“In operation 303, *the ASP.NET is read* - Fig. 3; the server receives the HTTP request which includes a URL that *specifies a resource*, such as an ASP.NET page, and *invokes the appropriate handler for processing the specified resources*”, [0036]; the request *identifies a dynamic web page content file*, [0012]),

wherein the Active Server Page includes a compiled user interface template (i.e. “Each time a request for the web page specifying an ASP+ resource is received, the server determines whether *a compiled class* (i.e. a compiled user interface template, which is compiled from the source code file created from elements (i.e. user interface templates) of the dynamic web page content file specified by the requested web page) - for that dynamic web page content file resides in memory. If the requested class does not exist in memory, it is created. Once the class is located, the server instantiates server-side processing objects from that class to dynamically generates web page content”, [0013], [0037]);

executing the Active Server Page to generate the requested Web Page (“Operation 304 generates a server-side control object hierarchy based on the contents of the specified dynamic content file, e.g. the ASP.NET page”, Fig. 3, [0036]. “Once the class which is compiled from

Art Unit: 2167

the source code file created from elements of the dynamic web page content file specified by the requested web page is located, *the server instantiates server-side processing objects from that class to dynamically generates web page content, and then renders, conducts to the client system*", [0013]); and

providing the requested Web Page to a source of the request (Fig. 2 - HTTP responses 212, [0031], *Operation 310 transmits the HTML code to the client in an HTTP response* – Fig. 3; the web page content is then rendered and conducted to the client computer system, [0013]).

As to claims 7, 21, Ebbo teaches a method comprising:

identifying a plurality of user interface templates associated with a Web-based applications (i.e. "in response to a client that transmits an HTTP request and *the request identifies a dynamic web page content file*, the server *creates a data model to store elements* (i.e. user interface template) *of the dynamic web page content file, evaluates or identifies the data model and generates a source code file* (from a plurality of user interface templates) *related to the dynamic web page content file based on the valuation of the data model*. Once the source code file is created, the source code file is compiled to create a compiled class in memory", [0012]. "The compiled class is used to instantiate server side processing object to render a response corresponding to a requested web page to be displayed on a client computer system", [0015]);

compiling each of the plurality of user interface templates into a single file containing a plurality of byte codes, (i.e. "In operation, the server receives a request from the client for a web page and the request identifies a dynamic web page content file [0012], specifically, the

ASP.NET page 410 is identified or referenced by a unique URL and further identified by “.aspx” suffix [0042]; once the ASP.NET page 410 is read into memory, *the server creates a data model to store elements* (i.e. user interface elements, or user interface templates specified from the dynamic web page content file that identified in the request) *of the dynamic web page content file, evaluates or identifies the data model and generates a source code file (from a plurality of user interface templates) that is related to the dynamic web page content file based on the valuation of the data model. Once the source code file - the file that contains a plurality of byte-code data or encoded data - is created, the source code file is compiled to create a compiled class*” (i.e. a compiled class is a single file contains a plurality of byte-codes from the source code file which generated from a plurality of user interface templates, [0012], [0037], [0042-0043]),

wherein the byte codes are capable of being executed by an execution engine (i.e. “*Once the class which is compiled from the source code file created from elements* (or user interface elements/templates) *of the dynamic web page content file* specified by the requested web page is located, *the server instantiates server-side processing objects from that class to dynamically generates web page content, and then renders, conducts to the client system*”, [0013]);

executing the plurality of byte codes when the Web-based application is executed (i.e. “*Once the class which is compiled from the source code file created from elements* (or user interface elements/templates) *of the dynamic web page content file* specified by the requested web page is located, *the server instantiates server-side processing objects from that class to dynamically generates web page content, and then renders, conducts to the client system,*

[0013]; or Operation **304** generates a server-side control object hierarchy based on the contents of the specified dynamic content file, i.e., the ASP.NET.page [0036]).

As to claims 2, 22, Ebbo teaches the user interface template has been compiled into a byte code format and the Active Server Page contains the byte codes ([0042]).

As per claim 3, Ebbo teaches the user interface template contains HTML code ([0024]).

As to claims 4, 23, Ebbo teaches the user interface template contains logic related to displaying information ([0046-0047]).

As per claim 5, Ebbo teaches the Active Server Page includes a plurality of compiled user interface templates ([0042-0044]).

As per claim 6, Ebbo teaches one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 1 ([0089]).

As per claim 8, Ebbo teaches the plurality of byte codes includes callback codes that call into the Web-based application code ([0038], [0086]).

As to claims 9, 20, Ebbo teaches the plurality of byte codes are executed by an execution engine in a Web server ([0036-0040]).

As per claim 10, Ebbo teaches the plurality of byte codes are contained in an Active Server Page ([0036-0044]).

As per claim 11, Ebbo teaches the byte codes include logic related to displaying information ([0046-0047]).

As per claim 12, Ebbo teaches one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 7 ([0089]).

As per claim 19, Ebbo teaches the Active Server Page contains a plurality of byte codes associated with a plurality of user interface templates ([0042]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2167

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 13-17, 24-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebbo et al. (US Pub No. 20030025728), in view of Sisco et al. (US Pub. No. 20030046364).

As to claims 13, 24, Ebbo teaches a method comprising:

creating a plurality of user interface templates associated with a Web-based application (i.e. “in response to the request identifies a dynamic web page content file, the server *creates a data model to store elements* (i.e. user interface templates) *of the dynamic web page content file, evaluates or identifies the data model and generates a source code file related to the dynamic web page content file based on the valuation of the data model*. Once the source code file is created, the source code file is compiled to create a compiled class in memory, [0012]. The compiled class is used to instantiate server side processing object to render a response corresponding to a requested web page to be displayed on a client computer system”, [0015]);

compiling the plurality of user interface templates into a plurality of byte codes (i.e. “the server creates a data model to store elements (i.e. user interface templates) of the dynamic web page content file, evaluates or identifies the data model and generates a source code file related to the dynamic web page content file based on the valuation of the data model. *Once the source code file is created* (from the user interface templates of the dynamic web page content file which contains a plurality of byte-code data or encoded data), *the source code file is compiled to create a compiled class* in memory, [0012]. The compiled class is used to instantiate server side

processing object to render a response corresponding to a requested web page to be displayed on a client computer system”, [0015]);

storing the plurality of byte codes associated with the plurality of user interface templates in a single file, (i.e. *Once the source code file is created* (from the user interface templates of the dynamic web page content file which contains a plurality of byte-code data or encoded data), *the source code file is compiled to create a compiled class in memory*, [0012]. The process ends with the return of a class reference to the server which enables the server to use the class [0012], [0043]), wherein the byte codes are capable of being executed by an execution engine in a Web server file (i.e. “Once the class which is compiled from the source code file created from elements of the dynamic web page content file specified by the requested web page is located, *the server instantiates server-side processing objects from that class to dynamically generates web page content, and then renders, conducts to the client system*”, [0013]).

Ebbo teaches creating a plurality of user interface templates using Visual Basic, Jscript, HTML code, [0006], [0012]; but Ebbo does not expressly teach the plurality of user interface templates are created using an Active Sever Page Language.

Sisco teaches “*a web page may be developed using Microsoft’s Active Server Pages, and may contain both HTML and ASP scripting codes*”, [0032], “the ASP script passes the data to a compiled Visual Basic program. The compiled Visual Basic program initiates sending data to Baan 48, so as ASP web pages can be utilized to input data into Baan”, [0032]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method for creating an intermediate language or source code file from a server-side resource or dynamic web page file using a hierarchically specified set of user

controls, as disclosed by Ebbo, to include the plurality of user interface templates are created using an Active Server Page Language, as taught by Sisco, because it would enable users to create hierarchically specified user defined control objects that process client side user interface elements of a web page. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make this combination in order to improve programming models that allow reuseable elements to be created and specified using easy-to-understand script-based programming language, as doing so would give the added benefit of providing a better method for interfacing between computer software and the Internet.

As per claim 14, Ebbo teaches executing the plurality of byte codes when the Web-based application is executed ([0041-0046]).

As to claims 15, 26, Ebbo teaches the plurality of byte codes include callback codes that call into the Web-based application code ([0038; 0086]).

As to claims 16, 25, Ebbo teaches executing a portion of the plurality of byte codes when the Web-based application is executed ([0041-0046]).

As per claim 17, Ebbo teaches one or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 13 ([0089]).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 02/08/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The declaration filed on 02/08/2007 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Ebbo reference, US Pub. No. 2003/0025728.

The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Ebbo reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). Per MPEP 715,

*The essential thing to be shown under 37 CFR 1.131 is priority of invention and this may be done by any satisfactory evidence of the fact. **FACTS, not conclusions, must be alleged.** Evidence in the form of exhibits may accompany the affidavit or declaration. **Each exhibit relied upon should be specifically referred to in the affidavit or declaration, in terms of what it is relied upon to show.***

*A general allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not sufficient. Ex parte Saunders, 1883 C.D. 23, 23 O.G. 1224 (Comm'r Pat. 1883). Similarly, a declaration by the inventor to the effect that his or her invention was conceived or reduced to practice prior to the reference date, **without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131.***

When reviewing a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration, the examiner must consider all of the evidence presented in its entirety, including the affidavits or declarations and all accompanying exhibits, records and 'notes.' An accompanying exhibit need not support all claimed limitations, provided that any missing limitation is supported by the declaration itself. Ex parte (vshinsky, 10 USPQ2d 1075 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989).

*The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). In re Borkowski, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ29 (CCPA 1974). **Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant.** 505 F.2d at 718-19, 184 USPQ at 33. See also In re HaMr, 333 F.2d 920, 142-USPQ 164 (CCPA 1964) (Affidavit asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when they occurred.").*

In general, proof of actual reduction to practice requires a showing that the apparatus actually existed and worked for its intended purpose.

The declaration and the accompanying corresponding emails, do not provide enough evidence to support all the claimed limitations prior to the reference date, therefore does not support conception of the claimed inventions.

It is noted, Applicant states "Attached to this declaration is a redacted invention disclosure document and a corresponding email used to submit the invention disclosure

Art Unit: 2167

document which evidences that the invention was conceived and reduced to practice before February 4, 2003, which predates the publication date of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0025728" see Declaration, page 1, lines 17-21, however, only the corresponding emails was submitted; and applicant does not submit the redacted invention disclosure document or give any clear explanation of the document pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant. This at best amounts to mere pleading.

Accordingly, Applicant has not established prior invention. The rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (571) 272-4112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham, can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax number to this Art Unit is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Miranda Le
May 21, 2007